

Sask.
Gov't. P.



Fifty-sixth Annual Report

of the

Local Government Board

of the

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

for the twelve months ended December 31

1970



Regina, Saskatchewan,
January 29, 1971.

The Honourable W. Ross Thatcher,
President of the Executive Council,
Legislative Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Sir:

I have the honour to transmit to you the
Report of the Local Government Board for the year
ending December 31, 1970.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,


H. S. McMillan,
Chairman.

Regina, Saskatchewan,
January 29, 1971.

The Honourable W. Ross Thatcher,
President of the Executive Council,
Legislative Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Sir:

Section 58 of The Local Government Board Act, being Chapter 43, Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1965, provides as follows:-

"58. (1) The board shall, in the month of January in each year, transmit to the president of the Executive Council for the year ending on the thirty-first day of December previous, a report showing briefly:

- (a) applications to the board and summaries of the findings made thereon;
- (b) the number and the nature of the inquiries that it has held of its own motion;
- (c) such matters as the Lieutenant Governor in Council directs.

(2) The report shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly during the first fifteen days of the then next ensuing session, or within fifteen days after its receipt if the Legislature is then sitting."

and pursuant to these requirements, the following pages summarize the work of the Board during the year 1970, and represent its Fifty-Sixth Annual Report.

The Local Government Board exists and operates by virtue of the provisions of The Local Government Board Act referred to above, from which it receives its powers and basis for its procedures. It is a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal, and has been in existence since January 1, 1914.

The Board has a wide variety of responsibilities assigned to it by the Legislature. Authority for its actions is contained in a number of statutes as listed in Appendix "A" hereto. These activities are primarily in the field of local government and involve, for the most part, some form of control over raising and spending capital funds. The primary purpose of the Board

would seem to be to preserve good credit ratings and to ensure financial stability of Saskatchewan local municipal governments in cases where any capital works are being financed through borrowed funds. The Board, therefore, has an interest in the financial implications of policies followed by cities, towns, villages, rural municipalities, school districts, school units, union hospital districts, and other local authorities in the province. Because of its position, the Board has influence beyond that provided by the statutes, and this influence together with the controls it legally possesses are directed towards encouraging prudent and careful operations by local governments in the province with the end result of retaining good credit ratings and strong financial positions.

The Board is also the public utility board for the province of Saskatchewan, and in this regard it exercises control over franchise agreements granted by municipal governments permitting private parties to operate utilities in the community. The volume of work in this area of the Board's jurisdiction is quite limited due to the small number of public utilities in the province owned and operated by private companies.

The Board is represented by its Chairman on the Municipal Water Assistance Board and the Industrial Towns' Committee. The members of the Board also constitute the Board of Revenue Commissioners under the Treasury Act which acts as a judicial body to hear appeals against provincial tax assessments and deals with cancellations and adjustments of monies owing to the Crown.

From time to time the Legislature assigns additional duties and responsibilities to the Board. Major additions to the Board's jurisdiction were contained in The Urban Municipality Act, 1970, which was passed at the 1970 Session of the Legislature. In very brief form, these included the following:

- (a) approval of the Board is required for all water rate bylaws (in addition to sewer service rate bylaws already a responsibility of the Board) for municipalities in the province, excepting cities. (Section 209)
- (b) approval of the Board must be obtained to the rate of interest used in accumulating sinking fund requirements. (Section 257)
- (c) approval of the Board is required for grants proposed by councils in any one year in excess of one-half of a mill. (Section 234)
- (d) approval of the Board is required to the creation of reserve funds by councils of municipalities for specific purposes up to a maximum of two mills in any one year. (Section 316)

- (e) control of budgets of municipalities upon request of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. (Section 239)

The bond market continued in a depressed state during 1970. Any long term investment funds, which could be found, were expensive. Throughout the year our best municipal credits would have to pay towards 10% if the funds could be located through the regular marketing channels. Local government officials have generally offered major resistance to borrowing at existing high levels, except for capital works of a pressing nature. For this reason, debenture sales in 1970 amounted to \$8,123,017.00 as compared with \$10,013,614.00 in 1969. Details of year to year figures on debenture borrowing by Saskatchewan local governments are shown in Tables I, II, III and IV of this report. Table V shows the level of local government debenture debt for a number of years up to the end of 1969.

An analysis of the sales of debenture issues by local governments during the year 1970 showed the following:

<u>Method of Sale</u>	<u>No. of Issues</u>	<u>Total Amount of Debentures</u>	<u>Average Money Cost</u>
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation	4	\$ 302,105.00	6.966
Through Investment Dealers	1	750,000.00	9.620
Locally by Local Government Officials	62	7,070,912.00	8.711
	<u>67</u>	<u>\$8,123,017.00</u>	

It will be noted that only one issue was sold through dealers and that over \$7,000,000.00 of securities were sold locally through the efforts of local government officials. These dedicated individuals are to be commended for the time and effort devoted to the marketing of their securities. The Municipal Financing Corporation became operative commencing January 1, 1970 and the Board believes that this agency will be of great assistance to local governments in the sale of their debentures in the future.

During the year under review the Board issued authorizations for proposed debenture issues of \$11,482,826.00 which is a slight increase over the \$10,046,832.00 authorized in 1969. Approval was also issued for local improvement works estimated to cost \$3,843,811.00 as compared with \$5,038,184.00 in 1969. It should be noted that these programs do not necessarily end in the issue of debentures, as projects may be abandoned subsequently to the authorization, more particularly,

if rejected by the burgesses or work petitioned out by property owners. In addition, the final costs of local improvement programs are reduced by cash received from property owners as prepayment of their frontage levies and/or monies obtained from other sources. In a limited number of cases the net cost of the work is financed from general funds of the municipality without the issue of debentures.

In the opinion of the Board the vast majority, if not all, of the capital works, or projects of a pressing nature, were arranged during 1970 despite the relatively low amount of long term borrowing. Many sources of funds were used in addition to the long term borrowing and every attempt was made to arrange the financing of these capital expenditures with the least oppressive effect to the taxpayers of the future as a result of the existing high cost of money.

In the matter of borrowing, the Board looks to the year 1971 with a cautious feeling of optimism. The short term money market has improved to a major extent and the Board is hopeful that this trend may extend to the long term market. Any easing of the situation will make it possible for our local governments to secure funds to carry out many of the capital works which they have postponed during the past couple of years.

At such time as the bond market does improve, the Board recommends that local governments institute a form of orderly planning of their capital works through the development and maintenance of five-year capital works programs. Moreover, the Board will continue to require a down payment of a minimum of 10% of the proposed borrowing which was brought into effect commencing January 1, 1970. It believes that this does not have any oppressive effect and is a good practice for various reasons.

During 1970 the Board held five enquiries as referred to in Appendix K. Decisions were rendered in each case as detailed in pages 7 to 24 inclusive. In addition, a decision respecting the Village of Dysart application to correct alleged errors in the special assessment roll of the village, which formed the subject of an enquiry during the latter part of 1969 was also given, and copy of the Board's formal order is set out in pages 25 to 30.

A brief summary of the Board activities over the course of 1970 follows below. Further details may be obtained by referring to the appendices to this report. The miscellaneous applications mentioned relate to a wide variety of matter dealt with by the Board on which it is not considered necessary to provide details.

244 Formal Board meetings were held;

128 Applications for debenture issues totalling approximately \$11,881,801.00 under various acts were dealt with;

- 96 Applications for approval to construct local improvement works under The Local Improvements Act were dealt with;
- 314 Miscellaneous applications were dealt with;
- 14 Budgets were examined and tax rates established as required under various acts;
- 21 Transactions in Sinking Funds under Board control were approved;
- 64 Transactions in R. M. Capital Trust Funds were dealt with by the Board as authorized in Section 204 of The Rural Municipality Act;
- 29 Transactions in other Capital Accounts were approved;
- 18 Agreements under The Housing and Special-care Homes Act 1965 were approved.

In addition to the formal meetings, statutory enquiries, etc., reported herein, the Board spent a great deal of its time in conference with officials of local governments, and others, who seek advice on a wide variety of matters within the Board's jurisdiction, including presentations respecting capital works programs, annual budgets, legal procedures, sale of debentures, etc. Several members, and the Board's Secretary, attended sessions of various conventions in the province such as the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, Town Administrators, R.M. Secretary-Treasurers, School Trustees Association, etc. The Board was not represented at the 1970 Conference of Public Utilities Commissions.

The Board is grateful for the co-operation received from local government officials during the period covered by this report. Board decisions have been accepted with good grace and understanding. Furthermore, the Board has noted a great desire on the part of local government people to accept advice and suggestions which will be of assistance in administering their financial affairs on a sound basis.

The Board expresses its appreciation to the officials of the various government departments, representatives of investment dealers, banking institutions, consulting engineers, architects and all others with whom it came into official contact for the co-operation and assistance which they provided during the year.

Revenues received by the Local Government Board in 1970 were \$25,263.03 with expenditures of \$94,085.37.

The foregoing (including the tables, reports and appendices attached hereto) is respectfully submitted as the report of the Local Government Board for the year ending December 31, 1970.

DATED at REGINA, Saskatchewan, this 29th day of January, 1971.

"H. S. McMillan"
Chairman

"M. A. Swenarchuk"
Member

"D. K. McCusker"
Member

"A. C. McEachen"
Secretary

IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 39A OF THE
LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT AND OF THE
APPLICATION FROM THE COUNCIL OF THE
TOWN OF LUMSDEN FOR THE APPROVAL OF
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD TO CORRECT
CERTAIN GROSS OR PALPABLE ERRORS IN
THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ROLL OF THE TOWN

Application was received by the Local Government Board from the Council of the Town of Lumsden for approval to correct certain gross or palpable errors in the Special Assessment Roll of the Town pursuant to the provisions of Section 39A of the Local Improvements Act, being Cap. 154, R.S.S. 1965 as amended with respect to certain sewer and water mains constructed as local improvements. The properties involved in the application are described as follows:

Item No. 1 Lots 2 & 3, Block B, Plan CZ2963
Item No. 2 Parcel "A", Plan FM 632

In accordance with due notice to the interested parties, the Board convened a hearing in the Council Chambers, Town of Lumsden, at the hour of two o'clock in the afternoon (Central Standard Time) on Tuesday, the 17th day of February 1970, for the purpose of hearing all parties interested in making representations to the Board in connection with the alleged errors in the special assessment roll of the Town referred to above.

The only persons to appear at the hearing were the Mayor of the Town, Mr. McLaren, and its Administrator, Mr. Smith; the latter submitted applications in writing from the assessed owners of the affected properties for correction of the errors in the special assessment roll. He also produced the special assessment roll of the Town, a copy of a plan of the subdivision containing the lots of Item (1) and an illustration of the parcel in Item (2).

On the basis of the information obtained from all available sources, we recommend that the Local Government Board approve of the following corrections in the special assessment roll in question:

Item (1) Lots 2 and 3 in Block B

The number of feet for which each of the above lots stood assessed was ninety-nine (99). The actual number of feet in each of these lots, according to the plan of the subdivisions in which each is shown, is sixty-six (66). That each lot was heretofore assessed at the former figure was due to the mis-reading in the said plan of the figure "66" as "99". Approval is recommended of a correction in the special assessment roll of the number of feet to be assessed for each lot from ninety-nine (99) to sixty-six (66) feet.

Item (2) Parcel A, Plan FM 632

While as referred to, the impression was created that the application involved the whole of Parcel "A", at the hearing information was provided (and confirmed by the entries in the special assessment roll) that it was south part of this parcel that was involved. Part of Parcel "A" is assessed in respect of sixty-six (66) feet. The balance of this parcel, i.e., the remaining most southerly portion, is the one covered by the application. Heretofore the latter has been assessed in the special assessment roll for one-hundred and thirty-three (133) feet. The error in this instance becomes obvious upon subtracting 66 from 189. It appears that, in error, the result obtained was 133 when in fact the correct one is 123. Approval is recommended of a correction in the special assessment roll in respect of said portion of Parcel "A" for the assessing of 123 feet rather than 133 feet.

DATED at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 17th day of March 1970.

"M. A. Swenarchuk"

Member
Local Government Board

"D. K. McCusker"

Member
Local Government Board

The Board concurred in the recommendation of the Members as above and adopted their report as the approval of the Board. The application is, therefore, granted.

"H. S. McMillan"

Chairman,
Local Government Board

IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 4 (1) (E) OF
THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT AND BYLAW
NO. 2387 OF THE CITY OF MOOSE JAW FOR
APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD
TO UNDERTAKE THE CONSTRUCTION OF STORM
SEWERS WITHOUT THE RIGHT OF PETITION
BY THE PROPERTY OWNERS CONCERNED.

Under authorization from the Local Government Board dated March 3, 1970, I conducted a hearing at two o'clock in the afternoon (Central Standard Time) of Wednesday, March 4, 1970, in the Council Chambers, City Hall, City of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, for the purpose of hearing any parties interested in the granting or refusing of an application by the Council of the City of Moose Jaw to the said Board for consent to undertake the construction of storm sewers on the undermentioned locations in the City of Moose Jaw without the right of petition by the property owners concerned in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph (e) of Subsection (1) of Section (4) of The Local Improvements Act, there being three drainage areas involved, as follows:

St or Ave	From	To
<u>DRAINAGE AREA NO. I</u>		
Main St. N.	Athabasca St. W.	Oxford St. W.
<u>DRAINAGE AREA NO. II</u>		
3rd Ave. N.W.	Manitoba St. W.	Caribou St. W.
<u>DRAINAGE AREA NO. III</u>		
Athabasca St. W.	Main St. N.	1st Ave. N.W.
1st Ave. N.W.	Athabasca St. W.	Caribou St. W.

The following locations do not abut on the proposed storm sewers but benefit and will be assessed if the works are constructed:

St or Ave	From	To
<u>DRAINAGE AREA NO. I</u>		
Ross St. W.	1st Ave. N.W.	Main St. N.
<u>DRAINAGE AREA NO. II</u>		
Manitoba St. W.	3rd Ave. N.W.	156' W. of 3rd N.W.
River St. W.	2nd Ave. N.W.	3rd Ave. N.W.
High St. W.	2nd Ave. N.W.	3rd Ave. N.W.
Fairford St. W.	2nd Ave. N.W.	4th Ave. N.W.
Stadacona St. W.	2nd Ave. N.W.	4th Ave. N.W.
Athabasca St. W.	2nd Ave. N.W.	3rd Ave. N.W.
Caribou St. W.	3rd Ave. N.W.	4th Ave. N.W.
Ross St. W.	Lane E. 4th N.W.	3rd Ave. N.W.
3rd Ave. N.W.	Caribou St. W.	Oxford St. W.

St or Ave	From	To
<u>DRAINAGE AREA NO. III</u>		
Hochelaga St. W.	Main St. N.	1st Ave. N.W.
Caribou St. W.	Main St. N.	2nd Ave. N.W.
1st Ave. N.W.	Caribou St. W.	Oxford St. W.

Mr. G. G. Botting, City Clerk, informed the hearing that notices of the hearing had been duly posted and published as required by the Board. Later, he filed a certificate to that effect. He also stated that no written submissions for presentation to the Local Government Board had been filed with him.

Appearing on behalf of the City of Moose Jaw were:

Mr. L. H. Lewry, Mayor
 Mr. M. J. Shelley, City Commissioner
 Mr. G. G. Botting, City Clerk
 Mr. W. J. Rintoul, City Assessor
 Mr. C. A. Bowden, City Engineer
 Mr. J. S. Tulloch, Assistant City Engineer
 Mr. S. Shumay, Engineering Assistant

The following were registered as wishing to speak in opposition to the project:

DRAINAGE AREA NO. I

Name	Address	Description of Property
A. J. Patterson	710 Main St. N.	Lots 8,9,10, Block 28, Old 96
Orville Boyle	919 Main St. N.	Gulf Oil Co. property
Gordon Rowe	815 Main St. N.	Part Lot 12, Blk. 23, High Park
Mrs. D. A. and V. Z. McGillis	621 Main St. N.	Part Lot 3, Blk. 27, Old 96
Mrs. Helen Tait	827 Main St. N.	Part Lot 12 & 13, Blk.23, High Park
C. Nelson	605 Main St. N.	Lots 4 & 5, Blk.27, Old 96
H. T. Navin	922 Main St. N.	Lot 3, Blk.10, High Park
C. V. Pierce	908 Main St. N.	Lots 1 & 2, Blk. 10, High Park
Godfrey Strem	616 Main St. N.	Part Lot 25, Blk.28, Old 96
E. M. Tysdal	820 Main St. N.	Lot 3, Blk. 1, High Park
Mrs. Irene Rustin	930 Main St. N.	Lot 5, Blk.10, High Park
Mrs. Barbara Patrick	946 Main St. N.	Lot 6, Blk.10, High Park
Geo Chow	620 Main St. N.	Lot 9, Blk.28, Old 96
Mrs. Ruby McKenzie	606 Main St. N.	Lot 12, Blk.28, Old 96

DRAINAGE AREA NO. II

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description of Property</u>
Roy Lewis	358 Stadacona St. W.	Lot 18, Blk. 12, Old 96
Geo Montcalm	330 Stadacona St. W.	Lot 14, Blk. 42, Old 96

DRAINAGE AREA NO. III

A. J. Patterson	710 Main St.	With property in this drainage area
-----------------	--------------	-------------------------------------

The City Engineer, Mr. Bowden, described, first of all, the storm sewer project in Drainage Area No. 1. Later in the hearing, he did the same with the other two drainage areas. He was assisted with other details and answers to questions by the City Commissioner, Mr. Shelley.

The over-all purpose of each of the storm sewers is to improve the drainage of the affected parts of the City and to eliminate the effects of flash floods in certain of its parts. In the case of the one in Drainage Area No. 1, its capacity, as was indicated, needs to be increased and this year appears to be the right one therefor in view of the plans to widen and pave Main Street. As to the storm sewer in Drainage Area No. 2, aside from other factors, its physical condition appears to be such as to make its replacement imperative.

The total cost of the three storm sewers is \$149,300.00, the particulars as to each being as follows:

<u>Drainage Area</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Property Share</u>	<u>City Share</u>
No. 1	32,500.00	7,450.00	25,050.00
No. 2	89,200.00	26,740.00	62,460.00
No. 3	27,600.00	12,036.00	15,564.00
	<u>\$149,300.00</u>	<u>\$46,226.00</u>	<u>\$103,074.00</u>

An amount of \$1,185.00 in property share on city owned property will bring the total city share to \$104,259.00; the latter will be decreased by \$2,250.00 by an earned grant.

A property owner may pay out his share of the cost at \$2.75 per frontage foot of property or have it amortised over a 20-year period at 32 cents per such foot.

All the persons registered to make representations on the three projects spoke in opposition to the same being undertaken.

Referring to Drainage No. 1, the principal reason given for opposing the project was their general inability to meet the extra cost and charges in view of the current difficult period in which business find themselves. Other reasons for opposition were: inability to stand extra amounts over the present tax load, depressed conditions of those depending on farm income and disruption of traffic. Only two of that number stated that the storm sewer was not needed. On the other hand several of those speaking in opposition stated that they do not question the need of it but they suggested a more favourable time than the present be awaited.

It was during this period that the first person registered, Mr. A. J. Patterson, presented a petition opposing this project. It listed 23 properties in the drainage area of which 17 had signatures opposing it. Of these, there were eleven (11) present at the hearing as owner-operators of property and two (2) as lessees. The 14th person also had his property listed in the petition but not subscribed thereto; he voiced his opposition in person. It might be noteworthy that the total number of properties in this area, both abutting and non-abutting but benefitting, is 37 and owners thereof 28.

Messrs. Lewis and Montcalm based their opposition to the project in Drainage No. 2 on the feeling that it is not necessary and that they would be unable to pay the extra amount over their present tax bill. Each claimed that their neighbourhood is opposed however there was no evidence to substantiate their claims.

Mr. Patterson, who had voiced opposition to the project in Drainage No. 1, expressed opposition to that of Drainage No. 3. I gather that his opposition to this project was more due to the over-all resultant financial load having regard to his total holdings in the two drainage areas.

His Worship, Mayor Lewry, addressed the hearing near its conclusion. He referred to the present difficult money market period, the high cost of money and to the need of holding the line and cutting back on projects not absolutely necessary. He pointed to the possibility of cutting out the Main Street project this year in view of the objections raised but said that the one in Drainage No. 3 should be proceeded with in view of the drainage problems in the area and the possibility of court cases arising.

Taking into account all information provided during the hearing on the question of the storm sewer in Drainage No. 1, I must defer to the level of opposition and recommend against an approval of the application by the City. As to the other two areas, there appears to be general acceptance of the two projects as evidenced by hardly any opposition, and I would recommend that the application of the City of Moose Jaw to construct storm sewers in Drainage Areas Nos. 2 and 3, under the provisions of Paragraph (e) of Subsection (1) of

Section 4 of The Local Improvements Act be approved. In approving the application, same provided for by Bylaw No. 2387, I would mention that these projects are to be part of the total 1970 local improvement program of the City, borrowing by debentures on account of which is to be limited to the maximum amount of \$200,000.00.

DATED at Regina, this 31st day of March, 1970.

"M. A. Swenarchuk"
Member,
Local Government Board.

The Board concurred in the recommendation of the Member as above and adopted his report as the approval of the Board, subject to the condition that the debentures covering the city's share of the cost of the project will be purchased by city funds at an interest rate as approved by the Board.

"H. S. McMillan"
Chairman,
Local Government Board.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PRELATE UNION
HOSPITAL DISTRICT AND SECTION 69
OF THE UNION HOSPITAL ACT PROVIDING
FOR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD TO
MAKE PAYMENTS FROM THE PROCEEDS OF
THE SALE OF THE ASSETS OF THE DISTRICT

The Prelate Union Hospital Board has forwarded to the Local Government Board the sum of \$41,031.82 representing monies realized from the sale of the hospital building, grounds and equipment and any other assets of the said Hospital Board pursuant to the provisions of Section 68 of The Union Hospital Act. Subsequently, the secretary-treasurer of the Village of Prelate forwarded a cheque to the Board for the sum of \$1,255.00 being payment of an amount owing by the village to the Prelate Union Hospital Board, giving a total amount of \$42,286.82. Since the receipt of these funds the Board has endeavoured to have them invested so that further amounts may be earned to the benefit of the municipalities concerned.

The Local Government Board is required to make payments from the said monies in the following order in accordance with Section 69 of The Union Hospital Act, namely:

- (a) In satisfaction of any current indebtedness of the Board or hospital district;
- (b) In satisfaction of the debenture indebtedness outstanding of the hospital district;
- (c) To each municipality or local improvement district that co-operated in the establishment of the hospital, a portion of any surplus funds remaining in the proportion to which each contributed to payment of the capital costs of the hospital.

Notices have been published in the June 10, 1970 and June 17, 1970 issues of the weekly newspaper "The Leader News" at Leader, Saskatchewan requesting that all claims against the Prelate Union Hospital Board be filed with the Local Government Board, Room 101, Legislative Building, Regina, Saskatchewan before the 24th day of June, 1970. A number of claims have been received and payments authorized by the Board from the funds referred to as follows:

Wik, Jeffery, Stark and Nabbs	
Audit Fees and Expenses re 1969 Audit -----	\$ 86.15
Prelate Centennial Hall	
Hall rent for hearing -----	\$ 20.00
The Leader News	
Publication of Notices re hearing -----	\$ 8.05

Mr. A. J. Hammel

For services rendered as Secretary-Treasurer,
Prelate Union Hospital Board - January 1, 1970
to May 31, 1970 -----

\$132.00

Foster Advertising Limited

Publication of Notices to creditors in the
Leader News -----

\$ 9.45

There is no reason to believe that there are any other unpaid accounts for the said Hospital Board. Furthermore, the Local Government Board has been informed and is satisfied that the said Hospital Board (or Hospital District) has no outstanding debenture obligations.

After deducting the payments referred to above totalling \$255.65 and taking into account interest that has been earned from short-term investments during the period that the funds have been with the Local Government Board amounting to \$1,947.93, the balance available for distribution under paragraph (c) of Section 69 of The Union Hospital Act is \$43,979.10.

There has been no problem to the Board in satisfying the requirements provided for in paragraphs (a) and (b) of Section 69 of The Union Hospital Act in this case but it has recognized the fact that there would be some difficulty in determining the distribution of the remaining surplus funds between the various municipalities involved. Accordingly, it arranged for a hearing to be held at Prelate, Saskatchewan, for the purpose of having all interested parties make representations with respect to this matter. After due notice the said hearing was convened in the Prelate Centennial Hall, in the Village of Prelate, Saskatchewan, at the hour of 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon (Central Standard Time) of Wednesday, May 27, 1970. Briefs were submitted by the following:

Mrs. J. P. Kosolofski, on behalf of the Prelate Union Hospital Auxiliary;

Mr. W. J. Kosolofski, on behalf of the Village of Prelate;

Mr. G. W. Hudec, on behalf of the R. M. of Happyland No. 231;

Mr. A. C. Schneider, on behalf of the R.M. of Clinworth No. 230.

A brief submitted by Mr. E. Marion, on behalf of the Leader Union Hospital Board, was subsequently withdrawn.

The Board is impressed with the careful thinking that obviously went into the preparation of these briefs and appreciates very much the spirit of co-operation that was displayed throughout the hearing. As was indicated at that time, the Board is very conscious of the serious responsibilities placed upon it

in distributing the surplus funds which remain in this case. The phraseology in the legislation is such that there is some ambiguity as to the intent of the statutory provisions. The Board has decided that it will have to arrive at its own conclusions in this connection.

There is no doubt that no part of these funds whatsoever could go to anyone except the municipalities involved. It is provided specifically that payments shall be made to each municipality "that co-operated in the establishment of the hospital". The Board is of the opinion that it would be a very narrow view to suggest that only municipalities which combined originally to form a hospital district should share in these surplus funds. It feels that it was intended that the word "establishment" in this case be considered in the broad sense to include all municipalities who have co-operated since the district was formed in keeping the facilities available for hospital purposes.

It is provided further that the municipalities that co-operated in the establishment of the hospital shall share "in the proportion to which each contributed to payment of capital costs of the hospital". The Board believes that it is very difficult to identify exactly the source of funds used for capital expenditures in this hospital operation. There are a number of avenues from which the Hospital Board has received funds which have undoubtedly been used to meet some capital costs other than those which have been obtained from the municipalities which are concerned in this case. One such instance relates to the activity of the Prelate Union Hospital Auxiliary which obviously has made a major contribution to the equipment and operations of the hospital. Patients have undoubtedly enjoyed greater comfort and convenience through the efforts of this organization than would otherwise be the case. Indeed it could very well be that the hospital may have had some difficulty in operating had it not been for the assistance of this group financially and otherwise. There is no doubt that the leadership in this organization emanated from the Village of Prelate and it could very well be that the major part of the assistance was made available from people living in the Prelate community. It would not, however, be reasonable to consider that contributions by this organization are payments on behalf of the Village of Prelate. Even if such a basis were reasonable, it would be impossible to determine the portion which should be credited to any municipality. It is a fact that, in all hospital districts, donations are made from various sources and in various ways to the equipping and various other costs of the operation. Surely a donation in this way represents a gift on the part of the donor rather than something on which some monetary return may be expected sometime in the future.

It would be impossible to identify donations and give credit to the municipalities where the donors may be residents. Although the Board has nothing but commendation and praise for the work done by the Prelate Union Hospital Auxiliary, it can find no way in which it could grant the request that all surplus funds remaining be left to the Village of Prelate on the basis of the excellent work which it has done during its lifetime.

The Board has been fully informed with respect to the history of the provision for hospital facilities at Prelate over the years up to the present time. There is no doubt that great leadership was evident on the part of people in the Village of Prelate in arrangements for a hospital and maintaining these facilities over the years. There have been major contributions, both financially and otherwise, by people living in the village and undoubtedly these people have been instrumental in retaining a hospital for the district up to recent times. It must, however, be repeated that it is impossible, in the Board's opinion, to identify the financial assistance or the value of other assistance which has been made available with respect to this facility. The Board is very much aware of the village debt for the installation of water-works and sewerage facilities and would like nothing better than to see that the surplus funds in this case were used to discharge the debt outstanding in this connection. However, it cannot conceive that this was the intention of the legislature nor that the Board's jurisdiction would permit such an arbitrary arrangement.

After very careful consideration over a period of several months, the Board has arrived at the conclusion that the division of these funds must be related to the contributions made directly to the hospital district by the municipalities concerned which funds have been used to finance the operations of this hospital. It believes that a reasonable approach is to utilize the percentages used by the Hospital Board in dividing the amount which was raised annually by taxation during the years since the establishment of the hospital district. This is a period of 21 years, being 1948 to 1968 inclusive. During this time it appears that the sum of \$57,876.00 was requisitioned on the municipalities of which \$30,420.00 was for operating deficiency and \$27,456.00 was for capital expenditure. The Board is convinced that the funds lose their identity and it is therefore impossible to determine the amounts that may have been contributed directly to capital costs. There is no question, however, as to the percentages of the total requisition contributed by each municipality. These percentages are as follows:

<u>Years</u>	<u>Village of Prelate</u>	<u>R.M. No. 231</u>	<u>R.M. No. 230</u>	<u>Total</u>
1948	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1949	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1950	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1951	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1952	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1953	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1954	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1955	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1956	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1957	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1958	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1959	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1960	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1961	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1962	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1963	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1964	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1965	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1966	33 1/3%	66 2/3%	Nil	100%
1967	13.411%	45.082%	41.507	100%
1968	13.411%	45.082%	41.507	100%

From the above, the Board calculates that, over the said 21 year period, the three municipalities contributed an annual average percentage as follows:

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Village of Prelate	31.436%
R.M. of Happyland No. 231	64.611%
R.M. of Clinworth No. 230	3.953%
Total	100.000%

The Local Government Board is convinced that the municipalities should share the surplus funds on the basis of the above percentages, and therefore orders that payments be made to them pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (c) of Section 69 of The Union Hospital Act in the following amounts:

Village of Prelate	\$13,825.27
R.M. of Happyland No. 231	\$28,415.34
R.M. of Clinworth No. 230	\$ 1,738.49

The Board strongly recommends that the councils of the above municipalities hold these funds for capital expenditures only, perhaps on the basis of additions to Capital Trust Funds, or apply them against the repayment of long term debt.

DATED at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 28th day of September,
A.D. 1970.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD

Per "H. S. McMillan"
Chairman

HEARING HELD ON THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1970,
IN FRONTIER, SASKATCHEWAN, TO DISCUSS
WITH OFFICIALS CONCERNED THE MATTER OF
FIXING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS TO BE
SET BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD FOR
DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY, GROUNDS AND
EQUIPMENT BY THE FRONTIER UNION HOSPITAL
BOARD

The following is an excerpt from the Minutes of the Local Government Board setting forth the terms and conditions which shall apply with regard thereto, dated May 29, 1970.

"Terms and Conditions: Frontier
Union Hospital District

The Minister of Public Health having approved of the disposal by the Frontier Union Hospital Board of its hospital buildings, its grounds and equipment; subject to the terms and conditions as prescribed by the Local Government Board, pursuant to Section 42 of The Union Hospital Act;

And a request having been received by the Board from the Frontier Union Hospital Board for the fixing of the terms and conditions which shall apply in the disposal of the said property;

The Board, after careful consideration, decided that the said hospital buildings, grounds and equipment may be sold for the sum of \$1.00 in cash."

IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMPANIES ACT AND AN APPLICATION BY
THE CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER FOR A VARIATION
OF THE TERMS OF THE FRANCHISE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE SAID CITY AND THE CANADIAN
UTILITIES LIMITED

Application has been received from the council of the City of Lloydminster for the approval of the Local Government Board to a variation in the terms of a franchise agreement between the said City and Canadian Utilities Limited for the supply of electric light and power to the said City and its inhabitants, which agreement was approved by the Local Government Board under date of December 10, 1968. The said variation in such franchise agreement involves an increase in the rates to be charged for electric light and power to the said City and its inhabitants as set out in an agreement proposed to be made between the City of Lloydminster and Canadian Utilities Limited filed with the Local Government Board.

The Local Government Board, after due notice had been given to the parties concerned and the public generally, convened an inquiry in the City of Lloydminster at the hour of 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon (Mountain Standard Time) of Wednesday, November 4, 1970, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Utilities Companies Act, being Chapter 136 R.S.S. 1965, for the purpose of hearing all parties interested in the granting or refusing of the said application.

At the appointed time and place the Board conducted its hearing with the following in attendance:

Before the Local Government Board: (hereinafter referred to as the "Board")

H. S. McMillan, Chairman
E. A. Swenarchuk, Member
D. K. McCusker, Member

Representing the City of Lloydminster: (hereinafter referred to as the "City")

G. J. Bryan, Esq., Q.C., Solicitor
Mayor L. Cavanagh
Alderman D. Wilson
Alderman R. Larsen
R. A. Robertson, Esq., City Commissioner
C. J. McGonigle, City Clerk
Blair Bowsfield, Esq., City Engineer

Representing Canadian Utilities Limited: (hereinafter referred to as the "Company")

B. V. Massie, Q.C., Solicitor
R. H. Choate, Esq.
J. E. Bagshaw, Esq.
Mr. Jones

Representing the Saskatchewan Power Corporation:

L. G. Ganne, Esq., Solicitor
Dave Anderson, Esq.

No one appeared for the purpose of objecting to the granting of the application referred to herein. Proof of the posting and publication of notices in accordance with the Board's requirements was submitted. After hearing representatives of both parties to the proposed agreement, the inquiry was adjourned and the matter has come before the Board today for decision.

Reference was made to the submission made by the company to the Public Utilities Board of Alberta for an upward revision of the rates to be charged to its customers for electric energy and the decision of that Board in connection with such application. The Board has received copies of the decisions of the Alberta Public Utilities Board. The indication is that the company was allowed a rate of return of $8\frac{1}{2}\%$ but subsequently agreed to accept \$500,000.00 less, and rate schedules were developed accordingly. These new rates apparently represented an increase generally of about 20% and the schedule which was applicable to Grand Prairie and Drumheller was proposed to be used for the City of Lloydminster.

Negotiations have been carried on between the City and the Company with a view to arriving at a rate schedule which would be acceptable to both parties. The one set out in the application is in that category. It appears to provide for increases of 12.27% on residential, 12.15% on general service, 18.09% on industrial and 11.80% on street and space lighting. The overall increase will be approximately 13.33% and apparently would give the company a rate of return of somewhere in the area of 8%.

In the Board's opinion a satisfactory explanation was given as to the reason for reduction in the rate charged at Lloydminster at the time of the granting of the franchise late in 1968. It is also apparent that the Company is prepared to accept a lower increase in Lloydminster than what applied elsewhere in Alberta because in Lloydminster it is in a competitive

position in that there are other sources of power available and because of the fact that the company's other customers are better off with Lloydminster on the system, even with this lower increase than not being on the system at all.

There is no dispute as to any of the information submitted. Moreover, the Board cannot see the necessity of going through a time consuming and costly rate case, when one has already been carried out by the Alberta Public Utilities Board for the company with the Lloydminster operation included. Indeed if such a procedure were carried out, the Board may very well arrive at the same conclusions as did the Alberta Board. The rates proposed to be charged in Lloydminster are, by mutual agreement, less than would apply from the Alberta Board decision. The rate of return is purported to be 8% which in the Board's opinion is extremely reasonable. The Board assumes that the Company is confident that it can operate satisfactorily both financially and from the standpoint of service with the lower revenue.

In the circumstances, the Board is satisfied that the rates, charges or schedules proposed to be imposed or effected as set out in the said agreement are fair and reasonable.

Therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in it by the Public Utilities Companies Act, more particularly Section 40 thereof, the Local Government Board hereby approves of the proposed agreement between the City and the Company, being Schedule "A" to proposed Bylaw No. 25-70 of the City of Lloydminster.

Dated at Regina, Saskatchewan, the 25th day of November A.D., 1970.

The Local Government Board

"H. S. McMillan"

Chairman

IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 39A OF THE LOCAL
IMPROVEMENTS ACT AND OF THE APPLICATION
FROM THE COUNCIL OF THE VILLAGE OF DYSART
FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOARD TO CORRECT CERTAIN GROSS OR PALPABLE
ERRORS IN THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ROLL OF
THE VILLAGE

Application was received by the Board from the council of the Village of Dysart for approval to correct certain gross or palpable errors in the special assessment roll of the village pursuant to the provisions of Section 39A of The Local Improvements Act being Cap. 154 R.S.S. 1965 as amended with respect to certain sewer and water mains constructed as local improvements. The lots involved in the application are as follows and have been itemized for ready reference purposes:

- Item (1) Lots 1,2,3, Block 1
- Item (2) Lot 25, Block 3
- Item (3) Lots 1,2,3, Block 4
- Item (4) Lots 4,5, Block 4
- Item (5) Lots 6,7, Block 4
- Item (6) Lots 8,9,10, Block 4
- Item (7) Lots 18, 19, Block 4
- Item (8) Lot 28, Block 5
- Item (9) Lots 5,6, Block 8
- Item (10) Lots 4,5, Block 9
- Item (11) Lot 1A, Block A.N.W.
- Item (12) Block E
- Item (13) C. of T.

In accordance with due notice to interested parties the Board convened a hearing in the Dysart curling rink waiting room in the Village of Dysart at the hour of 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon (Central Standard Time) on Tuesday, the 21st day of October, 1969 for the purpose of hearing all parties interested in making representations to the Board in connection with the alleged errors in the special assessment roll of the village as referred to above.

The overseer and secretary-treasurer of the village, together with various other persons interested in these matters, appeared at the hearing. The special assessment roll was produced and each item in the application was discussed in detail. The Board has now considered the material and information from the hearing and has arrived at its decisions with respect to the individual items involved.

The Board was disappointed to find a most unsatisfactory condition with regard to the records of the Village of Dysart in connection with the special assessments involved in this application. The special assessment roll, which was presented, had not been certified by the assessor as required by Section 39 of The Local Improvements Act. The village secretary, Mrs. Glass, who has recently assumed this office, stated that it was the only roll that she could find relating to the assessments in question. This caused the Local Government Board a considerable amount of concern and this is the first question which it had to decide, whether or not it would accept this material as being the proper local improvement special assessment roll for the said works. It had decided that it will deal with the cases presented to it based on the assumption that the material provided, copy of which is on its files, is the special assessment roll in question being the only one that can be located in the records of the village.

Another problem which the Board encountered relating to the records of the village was the inability of the village officials to locate certain vouchers relating to possible payments by property owners in several cases. The village secretary, Mrs. Glass, again indicated, quite definitely, that she was unable to find the records and the Board has therefore found it necessary to again make certain assumptions in these cases and its approval in this respect is qualified to that extent.

There is no question as to the position of the Local Government Board in dealing with cases under Section 39A of The Local Improvements Act. It is quite clear that it can only deal with gross or palpable errors and is not expected to deal in any way whatsoever with the question of number of feet with which any property should be assessed. On the surface, and based on any information that could be obtained by the Board, there are a number of instances involving incorrect mathematical calculations. As a matter of fact, practically all of the alleged errors fall within this category. It appears that in four cases the assessor failed to take into account certain payments which were made and should have had the effect of reducing the annual instalments.

Based on the assumptions referred to heretofore, the Local Government Board approves of the following changes in the special assessment roll in question:

Item (1) - Lots 1, 2 & 3 in Block 1

The annual instalment shown in this particular instance is \$53.72. It is obvious that the Court of Revision provided for 78 feet of frontage to be taxable against these lots and with a rate of 69¢ the resulting figure should be \$53.82. Approval is granted to the change of the annual instalment in this case from \$53.72 to \$53.82.

Item (2) - Lot 25, Block 3

There is some confusion as to which item in the special assessment roll relates to Lot 25 in Block 3 due to certain other figures which have also been placed in the relevant spaces. It seems obvious to the Board that the Court of Revision agreed to the assessment of 25 feet of frontage in this case and when this is multiplied by a rate of 69¢, the resulting figure would be \$17.25. The figure shown in the special assessment roll is \$17.50 and approval is granted to a change to the said \$17.25.

Item (3) - Lots 1, 2, & 3, Block 4

The annual instalment is shown as \$51.82. It is, however, obvious that the property was to be assessed with 78 feet and when multiplied by 69¢, the resulting figure would be \$53.82. Approval is granted to a change from \$51.82 to \$53.82.

Item (4) - Lots 4 & 5, Block 4

It is obvious that the Court of Revision intended that this lot be assessed with 52 feet of frontage, giving a total annual instalment of \$35.88. The figure shown in the special assessment roll is \$36.88. The Board approves of the change from \$36.88 to \$35.88.

Item (5) - Lots 6 & 7, Block 4

This case is exactly the same as the one covered by Item (4) above. The Board therefore approves of the change in the annual instalment from \$36.88 to \$35.88.

Item (6) - Lots 8, 9 & 10, Block 4

The indication is for 78 feet to be assessed against these lots which gives an annual instalment of \$53.82. The figure shown is \$51.62 and the Board approves of the change from the said \$51.62 to \$53.82.

Item (7) - Lots 18 & 19, Block 4

The special assessment roll provides for 100 feet to be assessed against this property and shows 15 feet in the exempt column. The figure in the annual instalment column is \$69.00 which would represent the requirement based on 100 feet. There is a prepayment receipt number shown and in the remarks column, an indication of "part payment 100.50". It appears obvious to the Board that the part payment was not taken into account in connection with the future annual instalments to be made by the owner of this property. If 15 feet were prepaid, then the annual instalment should cover 85 feet only. This would be \$58.65 and the Board approves of a change in this item from \$69.00 to \$58.65.

Item (8) - Lot 28, Block 5

The special assessment roll combines Lots 26, 27 and 28 in Block 5 and indicates 150 feet of taxable frontage with an annual instalment of \$86.25. There is a figure of 103.50 in the remarks column which would appear to represent what the annual instalment would be based on 150 feet. A receipt was produced showing payment of \$670.00 which related to prepayment of Lots 26 and 27. The lots were indicated to be 50 feet each which would mean that 100 feet in Lots 26 and 27 were paid out and 50 feet would remain against Lot 28. The Board approves of the change in the special assessment roll to show 50 feet assessable frontage against Lot 28, Block 5 for an annual instalment of \$34.50.

Item (9) - Lots 5 & 6, Block 8

The special assessment roll combines Lots 4, 5 and 6 in Block 8 for a taxable assessment of 150 feet. The annual instalment is shown as \$103.50 which would be correct for 150 feet taxable frontage. However, there is an indication of a prepayment receipt No. 1311 with the figures 335 in the upper left hand corner of such space. The Board concludes that the owner of this property paid \$335.00 and that this represented prepayment for Lot No. 4. There are three lots involved here for a total of 150 feet. Lot 4 being 50 feet and prepaid would leave Lots 5 and 6 for 100 feet and the annual instalment for 100 feet would be \$69.00. The Board therefore approves of the change in the special assessment roll to show that Lots 5 and 6 in Block 8 are to be assessed on an annual basis at the rate of \$69.00.

Item (10) - Lot 4 & 5, Block 9

The special assessment roll shows this property was to be assessed for 110 feet. The annual instalment is shown as \$74.90. 110 feet, however, would require an annual instalment of \$75.90. There are other figures in the remarks column and the Board is not clear as to what they represent. It does appear, however, to the Board that there is a mathematical error in multiplying 110 feet by 69¢. It therefore approves of the change in the special assessment roll for Lots 4 and 5 in Block 9 from \$74.90 on the annual instalment to \$75.90.

Item (11) - Lot 1A, Block ANW

The special assessment roll shows that this property was to be assessed for 80 feet. The annual instalment, however, is shown as \$53.20. A calculation of 80 feet multiplied by 69¢ gives a resulting figure of \$55.20. The Board believes that an error was made in this calculation and therefore approves of a change with respect to this property in the annual instalment from \$53.20 to \$55.20.

Item (12) - Block E

The special assessment roll shows that the Cupar School Unit owns property indicated as Block "E" where the taxable assessment was to be 314 feet. The annual instalment, however, is shown as \$179.40. No information could be produced to show that there had been any prepayments and no such conclusion could be reached from an examination of this item in the special assessment roll. The correct calculation for the annual instalment on 314 feet would be \$216.66. The officials of the School Unit have agreed to the change in this item and the Board, therefore, approves of the change from \$179.40 to \$216.66.

Item (13) - Indicated as C.T.

There is an item in the special assessment roll designated as C.O.T. with a taxable assessment of 100 feet and the annual instalment shown as \$69.00 which would be correct on that basis. However, there is a prepayment receipt number shown in the proper column as 1309 with the figures 335 indicated in the upper left hand corner of the same space. The Board has concluded that there was a prepayment on this property of \$335.00 covering 50 feet of the taxable frontage. This would leave a balance of 50 feet to be paid through annual instalments calculated to be \$34.50. The Board therefore approves of a change in the special assessment roll for this item on the annual instalment from \$69.00 to \$34.50.

At the hearing the Board was asked to examine two further cases not included in the application. These were as follows: Item (1) - Lots 1 to 3 inclusive, Block 8, and Item (2) - Lots 6 to 10 inclusive, Block 2.

Item (1) - Lots 1 to 3 Inclusive, Block 8

The special assessment roll in this case shows the annual instalment chargeable at \$89.80 which is 130 feet at 69¢ and appears to be correct. For some reason the village has been charging \$54.50 only. It would seem to the Board that the charge should be made in accordance with the special assessment roll at \$89.70.

Item (2) - Lots 6 to 10 Inclusive, Block 2

There is apparently a re-subdivision of these lots and this would not, in the Board's opinion, be a case which would be dealt with under Section 39A of The Local Improvements Act. It is suggested that this matter be dealt with by the assessor of the village as may be necessary in accordance with the provisions of The Local Improvements Act, particularly taking into account Section 30 thereof.

DATED at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 21st day of January, 1970.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD

"H. S. McMillan"

Chairman

"M. A. Swenarchuk"

Member

"D. K. McCusker"

Member

TABLE I

DEBENTURES ISSUEDSASKATCHEWAN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

1962 - 1970

By Class of Issuing Authority
in Thousands

	<u>Cities</u>		<u>Towns</u>		<u>Villages</u>		<u>City School Districts</u>		<u>Other School Districts</u>		<u>School Units</u>		<u>Hospitals</u>		<u>Other</u>		<u>Totals</u>	
	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.
1962	28	9,982	82	4,385	64	1,400	10	1,714	8	538	28	3,107	3	1,044	18	235	241	22,405
1963	32	10,185	82	3,944	118	2,806	6	1,398	10	632	27	3,496	5	645	11	272	291	23,378
1964	24	10,481	55	2,516	87	1,995	7	1,173	15	1,171	45	4,131	9	1,081	37	482	279	23,030
1965	39	9,954	96	4,439	124	2,600	18	2,094	6	244	61	5,185	5	1,400	80	1,237	429	27,153
1966	41	16,832	93	4,033	102	2,327	23	5,200	3	36	43	5,665	11	1,645	86	1,357	402	37,095
1967	52	11,682	137	6,613	126	2,412	15	1,523	3	185	42	4,947	11	1,818	34	714	420	29,894
1968	32	8,561	65	3,715	64	1,472	9	1,548	1	95	19	1,487	6	1,434	11	210	207	18,522
1969	25	5,593	29	1,100	33	653	5	743	-	-	14	1,624	3	233	10	68	119	10,014
1970	19	4,773	17	741	13	212	2	147	-	-	8	664	5	1,523	3	63	67	8,123

No. where it appears above means numbers of issues. Amounts are in thousands of dollars.

TABLE II

DEBENTURE ISSUES

SASKATCHEWAN URBAN MUNICIPALITIES

1962 - 1970
in Thousands

	CITIES			TOWNS			VILLAGES		
	Util- ities	Local Imp.	Schools	Other	Total	Util- ities	Local Imp.	Other	Total
1962	2,642	4,477	2,650	213	9,982	1,849	2,341	195	4,385
1963	3,200	3,535	1,550	1,900	10,185	1,100	2,691	153	3,944
1964	1,851	4,744	1,825	2,060	10,480	1,179	1,024	312	2,515
1965	2,168	3,804	-	3,982	9,954	1,231	2,404	804	4,439
1966	1,344	3,334	5,150	7,004	16,832	931	1,687	1,415	4,033*
1967	1,079	5,555	2,421	2,627	11,682	662	3,578	2,373	6,613
1968	1,145	3,517	2,747	1,152	8,561	755	2,184	776	3,715*
1969	1,247	3,349	-	997	5,593	114	660	326	1,100*
1970	1,211	2,932	777	-	4,920	141	570	30	741
						125	87	-	212

* Contains substantial issues by Municipal Corporation of Uranium City and District
1966 - \$110 1968 - \$222 1969 - \$268

Utilities means self-supporting municipal works including sewer and water works, transit systems and electric power utilities.

Local Improvement means works which are chargeable in whole or in part against abutting property, i.e. sewer and water mains, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, paving, etc.

TABLE III

DEBENTURES ISSUED

SASKATCHEWAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1962 - 1970
in ThousandsClassified as to function to which
borrowed funds were applied

	Urban (1) Municipal % Function	School (2) % Function	Hospital (3) % Function	%	Other	%	Total			
1962	58	13,012	36	8,114	5	1,044	1	235	100	22,405
1963	66	15,385	30	7,076	3	645	1	272	100	23,378
1964	57	13,167	36	8,300	5	1,081	2	482	100	23,030
1965	63	16,993	28	7,523	5	1,400	4	1,237	100	27,153
1966	44	16,457	44	16,461	8	2,820	4	1,357	100	37,095
1967	61	18,286	30	9,076	6	1,818	3	714	100	29,894
1968	58	10,741	33	6,137	8	1,434	1	210	100	18,522
1969	73	7,346	24	2,367	2	233	1	68	100	10,014
1970	62	5,067	18	1,441	19	1,553	1	62	100	8,123

(1) Includes city, town and village borrowing except for city borrowing on behalf of school boards.

(2) Includes school districts (public and separate), school units and amounts borrowed by cities and towns on behalf of school boards.

(3) Includes union hospital districts and amounts borrowed by cities for hospital purposes.

TABLE IV

DEBENTURES ISSUED
SASKATCHEWAN CITIES AND INCLUDING

ISSUES FOR COLLEGIATES, PUBLIC

AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

1962 - 1970
in Thousands

<u>City</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Estevan	272	210	108	291	106	581	1,419	265	-
Lloydminster*	42	90	125	55	876	735	417	167	247
Melville	100	108	56	436	320	244	350	456	22
Moose Jaw	419	950	357	376	675	1,219	335	302	180
North Battleford	144	221	110	570	478	115	1,125	65	44
Prince Albert	227	160	580	275	1,069	550	393	-	-
Regina	5,144	5,161	4,002	3,969	7,142	2,550	4,038	2,499	720
Saskatoon	3,847	3,911	6,044	5,527	9,996	4,853	1,981	1,972	2,729
Swift Current	875	397	112	185	604	1,385	192	80	67
Weyburn	155	-	-	180	738	703	115	384	697
Yorkton	587	365	285	239	904	1,005	161	313	461

* Debenture issues for Lloydminster are authorized by Complementary Orders in Council of the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

TABLE V

SASKATCHEWAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEBENTURE DEBT

December 31

in Thousands

Year	Net Municipal Debt				Total School Debt (2)	Hospital Debt (3)	Telephone Debt	Grand Total
	City (1)	Town (1)	Village	R.M.				
1957	48,758	7,206	207	141	23,517	6,827	456	87,112
1960	74,177	11,644	190	235	42,027	8,686	627	137,586
1965	88,350	28,399	8,834	1,151	64,068	9,019	1,242	201,063
1966	93,891	31,100	10,428	1,801	77,687	10,682	1,549	227,138
1967	96,620	35,588	11,843	1,849	80,718	11,765	1,600	239,983
1968	95,678	37,799	12,365	1,558	81,612	12,370	1,441	242,823
1969	94,727	36,424	12,042	1,117	78,415	11,225	1,310	235,260

NOTE:

The above table does not include debenture debt for Conservation and Development Areas.

These figures were compiled from reports obtained from the Department of Municipal Affairs and from Local Government Board records.

{1} - Excludes net secondary school debt.

{2} - Includes net secondary school debt. Borrowings for secondary schools are carried out by the urban municipality in which they are located.

{3} - Includes municipal hospital debt except for Regina and Saskatoon. In these cases the net hospital debt is included in the City Municipal debt figure.

APPENDIX INDEX

- A - Statutes forming legal basis for Local Government Board activities.
- B - Summary of debentures signed and sealed by the Board in 1970.
- C - Summary of authorizations and refusals of debenture issues in 1970.
- D - Proposed local improvement projects approved and refused by the Board in 1970.
- E - Authorizations of sinking fund investments.
- F - Surplus sinking fund earnings withdrawals.
- G - Miscellaneous applications respecting purchase and sale of investments considered by the Board in 1970.
- H - Transactions of Capital Accounts including Electric Light Trust Accounts.
- I - Capital Trust Funds.
- J - Local authority estimates approved and tax rates authorized.
- K - Inquiries and appeals held by the Board.
- L - Orders issued by the Local Government Board in 1970 under The Public Health and Union Hospital Acts.
- O - Miscellaneous applications dealt with by the Board in 1970.
- Q - Housing Company agreements approved in 1970.
- R - Deferrals approved (Cities, Towns, Villages, Rural Municipalities, School Units and Union Hospitals)
- S - Water Rates and/or Sewer Service Charge Bylaws approved by the Board in 1970.

APPENDIX ASTATUTES FORMING LEGAL BASIS FOR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD ACTIVITIES

The Local Government Board Act
The Local Government Board (Special Powers) Act
The Local Government Board (Temporary Special Powers) Act
The Rural Municipality Act
The Conservation and Development Act
The Rural Telephones Act
The Union Hospital Act
The School Act
The Larger School Units Act
The Secondary Education Act
Charter of the City of Lloydminster
Charter of The Municipal Corporation of Uranium City
and District
The Public Utilities Companies Act
The Health Services Act
The Public Health Act
The Housing and Special-care Homes Act 1965
The Municipal Improvements Assistance Act
The Libraries Act
The Lloydminster Municipal Amalgamation Act
The Municipal Corporation of Uranium City and District Act
The Municipal Public Works Act
The Municipal Debentures Repayment Act
The Trustee Act
The Power Corporation Act
The Water Rights Act
The Water Users Act
The Lloydminster Hospital Act
The Gas and Electric Rates (Public Corporations) Act
The Local Improvements Act
The Industrial Towns Act
The Regional Park Act
The Housing and Urban Renewal Act 1966
The Hospital Revenue Act 1966
The Cemeteries Act
The Urban Municipal Elections Act
The Urban Municipality Act 1970

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF DEBENTURES
SIGNED AND SEALED* BY BOARD 1970

<u>Local Authority</u>	<u>No. of Issues</u>	<u>Amounts</u>	<u>For Detail See</u>
Cities	19	4,773,037.	Appendix B-1
Towns	17	741,155.	Appendix B-2
Villages	13	212,425.	Appendix B-3
Rural Municipalities	2	56,000.	Appendix B-4
School Districts	2	147,000.	Appendix B-5
School Units	8	664,000.	Appendix B-6
Union Hospital Districts	5	1,522,900.	Appendix B-7
Rural Telephone Companies	Nil	Nil	Appendix B-8
Conservation and Development Areas	1	6,500.	Appendix B-9
	67	\$8,123,017.	

* i.e. Issued by Local Authorities

APPENDIX B-1

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

C I T I E S

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Melville	2	20 13	5 1/4 8	5.25 8.00	Par Par	18,922.	3,267.		22,189.
Moose Jaw	1	20	8 1/2	8.50	Par	52,669.	109,560.	17,771.(1)	180,000.
North Battleford	1	10	8	8.00	Par		44,000.		44,000.
Regina	3	10 20 15	8 8 9 5/8	8.00 8.00 9.63	Par Par Par	76,000.	237,000. 138,000.	122,000.(1)	573,000.
Saskatoon	7	25 10 15 20 25 1-5 6-10 25	9 1/2 8 8 8 8 9 1/4 9 & 9 1/4	9.63 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 9.00 9.25 9.34	99.09 Par Par Par Par Par) Par) 99.11	619,461.	243,794. 18,461. 160,000. 497,000.	750,000.(2)	2,728,716.
Swift Current	1	10	8	8.15	99.28		67,000.	440,000.(1)	67,000.

APPENDIX B-1 (Continued)

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Weyburn	2	20	8 1/4 & 9 1/2	8.95	99.28			630,000.(3)	697,000.
		10	8	8.00	Par		67,000.		
Yorkton	2	20	8 3/4	8.75	Par	211,132.*		250,000.(4)	461,132.
		20	6.9932						
	19					\$978,184.\$1,585,082.		\$2,209,771.	\$4,773,037.

* Capital portion chargeable against system as a whole. All others in this column are "local improvement" issues.

- (1) Storm Sewers
- (2) Trunk Storm, Sanitary Sewer Mains and Sewage Lift Station
- (3) Comprehensive High School
- (4) Developing York Lake Aquifer

APPENDIX B-2

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

T O W N S

Town	No. of Iss.	Term Yrs.	Coup. Rate	Money Cost	Price	Sewer & Water	Surface Works	Other	Total
Allan	1	20	8 1/2	9.71	90.24				
Assiniboia	1	15	8	8.00	Par		13,000.	51,000.(1)	51,000.
Carrot River	1	10	9	9.00	Par				13,000.
Eastend	1	15	8 3/4	9.33	96.20		39,000.	30,000.(2)	30,000.
Kamsack	2	15	8	8.00	Par		65,000.		39,000.
		20	8	8.00	Par	814.			65,814.
Kindersley	1	20	8 1/4	9.01	94.48	58,000.	32,000.		90,000.
Kipling	1	20	9 1/2	9.64	99.00	22,000.			22,000.
Meadow Lake	1	20	6.9932			67,360.*			67,360.
Melfort	1	5	8 1/2	8.50	Par		47,249.		47,249.
Moosomin	2	20	9 3/4	9.86	100.11	45,000.	84,000.		155,000.
		20	9 3/4	9.86	100.11	26,000.			
Nipawin	1	20	8	8.26	98.03	21,000.			
Unity	1	10	8 3/4	8.75	Par		57,000.		21,000.
Uranium City	1	10	8	8.00	Par		8,732.		57,000.
Wilkie	1	10	6	6.09	99.55			30,000.(4)	8,732.
Wolseley	1	10	9 1/2	9.50	Par			44,000.(3)	30,000.
									44,000.
	17					\$240,174.	\$345,981.	\$155,000.	\$741,155.

* Capital portion chargeable against system as a whole. All others in this column are "local improvement" issues.

- (1) Storm Sewers.
- (2) New well and supply line to water distribution system.
- (3) Iron Removal Plant and Storage.
- (4) Medical Clinic.

APPENDIX B-3

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

V I L L A G E S

<u>Village</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Avonlea	1	10	8 1/2	8.50	Par	30,000.*		13,500.(1)	13,500.
Bethune	1	10	9	9.00	Par	3,000.			30,000.
Hodgeville	2	15	8	9.75	90.14	24,000.			27,000.
		10	8	9.75	92.56	16,012.*			
Hyas	1	10	6.4766			30,000.*			16,012.
La Ronge	1	15	9	9.20	98.67	30,000.			30,000.
Manitou Beach	1	10	8	8.22	98.88	20,000.			20,000.
Meota	1	10	8 1/4	9.14	95.71	12,000.			12,000.
Paradise Hill	2	9	8 1/2	8.50	Par	8,200.*			28,200.
		10	9	9.00	Par	20,000.*			
Quill Lake	1	20	6 1/2	6.95	95.00	19,612.			19,612.
St. Benedict	1	10	6.9932			7,601.*			7,601.
Wawota	1	15	9	9.27	98.34	8,500.			8,500.
						\$198,925.		\$13,500.	\$212,425.

* Capital portion chargeable against system as a whole. All others in this column are "local improvement" issues.

(1) Improvements to water distribution system.

APPENDIX B-4

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

RURAL MUNICIPALITIES

<u>Rural Municipality</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Total</u>
Poplar Valley No. 12	1	10	8	8.00	Par	Purchase land and building for use as office	30,000.
Redberry No. 435	1	5	8 1/2	8.50	Far	Purchase road machinery	25,000.
	2						\$56,000.

APPENDIX B-5

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<u>School District</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Total</u>
Graton R.C.S. No. 13	2	15	9 3/4	9.81	100.12	82,000.
	2	15	9 3/4	9.81	100.12	65,000.
						\$147,000.

Issues were for the construction of additions to existing schools.

APPENDIX B-6

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

SCHOOL UNITS

<u>School Unit</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Total</u>
Arcola No. 10	1	15	8 3/4	9.34	96.13	80,000.
Herbert No. 23	1	5	9	9.00	Par	40,000.
Leader No. 24	1	10	8 3/4	9.34	97.19	100,000.
Melville No. 26	2	15	8	8.29	98.01	35,000.
		15	8	8.35	96.51	39,000.
Outlook No. 32	1	15	8/9 3/4	9.23	99.43	160,000.
Prince Albert No. 56	1	10	9	9.00	Par	40,000.
Rosetown No. 43	1	5	7	7.00	Par	*170,000.
						<u>\$664,000.</u>

* Purchase St. Joseph's school site in the Town of Rosetown.

All other issues were for construction of new or additions to existing schools.

APPENDIX B-7

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

UNION HOSPITAL DISTRICTS

<u>Hospital District</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Total</u>
Langenburg	1	5	9	9.00	Par	60,000.
Moose Jaw	1	20	8	8.99	91.87	1,200,000.
Nipawin	1	10	8 3/4	8.75	Par	70,000.
Rosthern	1	10	8 1/2	8.50	Par	90,000.
Swift Current	1	5	8	8.00	Par	102,900.
	<u>5</u>					<u>\$1,522,900.</u>

All issues were for constructing and equipping new or extensions to existing facilities.

APPENDIX B-9

DEBENTURES SIGNED AND SEALED BY THE BOARD 1970

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AREAS

<u>Conservation and Development Area</u>	<u>No. of Iss.</u>	<u>Term Yrs.</u>	<u>Coup. Rate</u>	<u>Money Cost</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Total</u>
Kelvington No. 96	1	10	9	9.00	Par	\$6,500.

Issue was for flood control.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATIONS, REFUSALS OR PARTIAL REFUSALS OF DEBENTURE ISSUES

<u>Local Authority</u>	<u>Number of Authorizations</u>	<u>Amounts</u>	<u>No. of Refusals</u>	<u>Amounts</u>	<u>For Detail See</u>
Cities	58	\$ 7,750,705.	4	\$ 69,775.	Appendix C-1
Towns	20	854,408.	1	13,000.	Appendix C-2
Villages	10	136,513.	2	9,200.	Appendix C-3
Rural Municipalities	3	67,000.	Nil	Nil	Appendix C-4
School Districts	8	1,496,000.	4	253,000.	Appendix C-5
School Units	7	629,000.	3	21,000.	Appendix C-6
Union Hospital Districts	3	450,000.	2	33,000.	Appendix C-7
Rural Telephone Companies	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Appendix C-8
Conservation and Development Areas	3	99,200.	Nil	Nil	Appendix C-9
	<u>112</u>	<u>\$11,482,826.</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>\$398,975.</u>	

APPENDIX C-1

AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUES

C I T I E S

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Melville	3	18,922.	2,464. 803.		22,189.
Moose Jaw	6	33,575. 14,877.	113,777.	17,771.(1) 1,150,000.(2)-x 171,000.(3)-x	1,501,000.
North Battleford	1	66,000.*			66,000.
Prince Albert	1			1,160,000.(9)	1,160,000.
Regina	19	5,455. 70,545. 65,064. 936.	20,000. 14,000. 229,747. 7,253. 31,147. 7,853. 47,000. 18,000.	51,467.(1) 4,533.(1) 950,000.(4) 225,000.(5) 180,000.(6) 160,000.(7) 450,000.(8)	2,538,000.
Saskatoon	17	4,575.	129,500. 13,909. 33,385. 67,000. 346,765. 150,993. 2,271.	557,336.(1) 57,551.(1) 145,000.(10)-x	1,684,852.

APPENDIX C-1 (Continued)

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Saskatoon (Cont'd.)					
Swift Current	1		16,190. 32,700. 2,306. 3,127. 42,208. 80,036.		67,078.
Weyburn	2		67,080.	350,000. (11)-x	417,080.
Yorkton	8	71,773. 33,920. 16,159.	6,819. 6,382. 78,356. 38,227. 42,870.		294,506.
	58	\$401,801.	\$1,719,246.	\$5,629,658.	\$7,750,705.

* Capital portion chargeable against system as a whole. All others in this column are "local improvement" issues.

-x Application partially refused.

- (1) Storm Sewers
- (2) Addition to Albert E. Peacock Technical High School
- (3) New Y.M.-Y.W.C.A.
- (4) Addition to Miller Composite High School
- (5) Two lane of roadway on Pasqua Street
- (6) Extending and upgrading street lighting
- (7) Improving and developing Mount Pleasant, A.E.Wilson and King's Parks Areas
- (8) Water Feeder Line
- (9) Primary Sewage Treatment Facilities
- (10) Modification and improvement of diamond intersection
- (11) Water Treatment Plant

APPENDIX C-1 (Continued)

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO BORROW BY WAY
OF DEBENTURE REFUSED OR PARTIALLY REFUSED

C I T I E S

<u>City</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Moose Jaw	2		10,000.(1) 29,000.(2)		39,000.
Saskatoon	1			30,000.(3)	30,000.
Weyburn	1			775.(4)	775.
	<u>4</u>		<u>\$39,000.</u>	<u>\$30,775.</u>	<u>\$69,775.</u>

- (1) Addition to Albert E. Peacock Technical High School
 (2) New Y.M.-Y.W.C.A.
 (3) Modification and improvement of diamond intersection
 (4) Water treatment plant

APPENDIX C-2

AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUES

T O W N S

<u>Town</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Allan	1	30,000.*		51,700.(1)	51,700.
Carrot River	1	20,000.*			30,000.
Eastend	2	20,000.*	39,000.		59,000.
Eatonia	1	16,000.*			16,000.
Kamsack	2	814.	65,000.		65,814.
Meadow Lake	1			25,000.(1)	25,000.
Melfort	1	45,000.	47,249.		47,249.
Noosomin	2	85,532.*	84,000.		129,000.
Nipawin	1	43,800.*			85,532.
Preeceville	2	10,000.*			53,800.
		70,000.*			
Tisdale	1		57,681.		70,000.
Unity	1		8,732.		57,681.
Uranium City	1				8,732.
Watrous	1	80,900.*			80,900.
Wilkie	1			30,000.(2)-x	30,000.
Wolseley	1	44,000.*			44,000.
		\$446,046.	\$301,662.	\$106,700.	\$854,408.

* Capital portion chargeable against system as a whole. All others in this column are "local improvement" issues.

-x Application partially refused.

- (1) Storm Sewers
- (2) Medical Clinic

APPENDIX C-2 (Continued)

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO BORROW BY WAY
OF DEBENTURE REFUSED OR PARTIALLY REFUSED

T O W N S

<u>Town</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wilkie	1			13,000. (1)	\$13,000.

(1) Constructing a medical clinic

APPENDIX C-3

AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUES

V I L L A G E S

<u>Village</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Avonlea	1	13,500.*-x			13,500.
Bethune	1	30,000.*			30,000.
Cadillac	1	2,499.			2,499.
Elfros	1	12,913.			12,913.
Hodgeville	2	24,000.			27,000.
		3,000.			
Landis	1	10,000.*			10,000.

APPENDIX C-3 (Continued)

<u>Village</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Paradise Hill	1	20,000.*-x			20,000.
Vibank	1	12,000.*			12,000.
Wawota	1	8,601.			8,601.
	10	\$136,513.			\$136,513.

* Capital portion chargeable against system as a whole. All others in this column are "local improvement" issues.

-x Application partially refused.

APPENDIX C-3 (Continued)

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO BORROW BY WAY
OF DEBENTURE REFUSED OR PARTIALLY REFUSED

V I L L A G E S

<u>Village</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Sewer & Water</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Avonlea	1	4,200.			4,200.
Paradise Hill	1	5,000.			5,000.
	2	\$9,200.			\$9,200.

APPENDIX C-4AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUESRURAL MUNICIPALITIES

<u>Rural Municipality</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Total</u>
Antler No. 61	1	Constructing a swimming pool in the Town of Redvers	11,000.
Poplar Valley No. 12	1	Purchasing land and building for office	30,000.
Redberry No. 435	1	Purchasing road machinery	26,000.
	<u>3</u>		<u>\$67,000.</u>

APPENDIX C-5AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUESSCHOOL DISTRICTS

<u>School District</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Graton R.C.S. No. 13	6	-x 576,000.
Saskatoon S.D. No. 13	1	-x 215,000.
St. Paul's R.C.S. No. 20	1	-x 705,000.
	<u>8</u>	<u>\$1,496,000.</u>

-x Application partially refused.
All issues were for the construction of new or additions to existing schools.

APPENDIX C-5 (Continued)

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO BORROW BY WAY
OF DEBENTURE REFUSED OR PARTIALLY REFUSED

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<u>School District</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Total</u>
Graton R.C.S. No. 13	2	156,000.
Saskatoon S. D. No. 13	1	7,000.
St. Paul's R.C.S. No. 20	1	90,000.
	4	\$253,000.

APPENDIX C-6

AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUES

SCHOOL UNITS

<u>School Unit</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Arcola No. 10	1	80,000.
Herbert No. 23	1	40,000.
Leader No. 24	1	100,000.
Melville No. 26	1	39,000.
Outlook No. 32	1	160,000.
Prince Albert No. 56	1	40,000.
Rosetown No. 43	1	170,000.
	7	\$629,000.

-x Application partially refused.
All issues were for the construction of new or additions to existing schools.

APPENDIX C-6 (Continued)

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO BORROW BY WAY
OF DEBENTURE REFUSED OR PARTIALLY REFUSED

SCHOOL UNITS

<u>School Unit</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Total</u>
Herbert No. 23	1	10,000.
Melville No. 26	1	6,000.
Rosetown No. 43	1	5,000.
	<u>3</u>	<u>\$21,000.</u>

APPENDIX C-7

AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUES

UNION HOSPITAL DISTRICTS

<u>Hospital District</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Total</u>
Melfort	1	Addition and renovations to present facilities	-x 290,000.
Nipawin	1	Addition and renovations to present facilities	-x 70,000.
Rosthern	1	Addition and renovations to present	90,000.
	<u>3</u>		<u>\$450,000.</u>

-x Application partially refused.

APPENDIX C-7 (Continued)

APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO BORROW BY WAY
OF DEBENTURE REFUSED OR PARTIALLY REFUSED

UNION HOSPITAL DISTRICTS

<u>Hospital District</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Total</u>
Melfort	1	Addition and renovation to present facilities	20,000.
Nipawin	1	Addition and renovation to present facilities	13,000.
	2		\$33,000.

APPENDIX C-9

56

AUTHORIZATION OF DEBENTURE ISSUES
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AREAS

<u>Conservation and Development Area</u>	<u>No. of Author.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Kelvington No. 96	1	11,000.
Souris	1	85,200.
St. Louis	1	3,000.
	3	\$99,200.

These issues were for flood control.

APPENDIX D

PROPOSED LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

APPROVED BY BOARD 1970

Work likely to be done in 1970 and debentures issued in 1971

<u>City</u>	<u>Sewer and Water Mains</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Total</u>
Lloydminster	20,870. 32,950.	8,346. 10,930. 13,484. 945. 3,923. 3,713.	95,161.
Melville		76,000. 39,500. 14,400.	129,900.
Moose Jaw	52,900. 83,300. 116,800.(1)	128,400. 5,800. 113,900.	501,100.
North Battleford		38,900. 34,975. 23,990. 58,225. 7,290. 2,155. 5,346.	170,881.

APPENDIX D (Continued)

<u>City</u>	<u>Sewer and Water Mains</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Total</u>
Prince Albert		117,588. 240,330.	357,918.
Regina	4,000. 4,100. 65,810. 52,200. 246,320. (1)	250,818. 476,000. 37,340. 227,000. 12,100. 15,960.	1,391,648.
Saskatoon	5,300. 11,600.	121,300. 29,440. 223,870.	391,510.
Swift Current		14,549. 12,618. 94,750.	121,917.
Weyburn	46,825. 23,925.	1,808.	72,558.
Yorkton		1,060. 3,600. 47,300.	51,960.
Total for Cities	\$766,900.	\$2,517,653.	\$3,284,553.
(1) Storm Sewers			

APPENDIX D (Continued)

<u>Town</u>	<u>Sewer and Water Mains</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Total</u>
Biggar		13,750.	13,750.
Canora		1,067.	2,047.
Gravelbourg	4,550.	980.	7,450.
Gull Lake	2,900.		
Hudson Bay		1,924.	1,924.
		13,800.	122,570.
		15,650.	
		86,120.	
		7,000.	
		12,837.	
		1,850.	21,097.
		860.	
Humboldt	2,300.		
	3,250.		
Kindersley	32,500.		59,000.
	26,500.		
Melfort	5,050.	33,937.	33,937.
Moosomin	7,038.		12,088.
Nipawin			
Outlook			
Rosthern		5,750.	12,050.
		6,300.	
		1,400.	16,400.
		15,000.	
		2,600.	7,640.
		5,040.	
		5,765.	5,765.
Unity	1,100.		2,300.
Warman	1,200.		
	63,045.	1,010.	1,010.
			63,045.
Total for Towns	\$149,433.	\$232,640.	\$382,073.

APPENDIX D (Continued)

<u>Village</u>	<u>Sewer and Water Mains</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Total</u>
Bethune	40,000. 2,400.		42,400.
Gainsborough			
Holdfast		20,900.	20,900.
La Ronge		4,549.	4,549.
	12,500. 8,400.		20,900.
Leoville	45,580.		45,580.
Paradise Hill	37,500.		37,500.
Regina Beach	3,056.		3,056.
Theodore	2,300.		2,300.
Total for Villages	<u>\$151,736.</u>	<u>\$25,449.</u>	<u>\$177,185.</u>
		<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	<u>\$3,843,811.</u>

APPENDIX D (Continued)

PROPOSED LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
REFUSED BY BOARD 1970

<u>CITY</u>	<u>Sewer and Water Mains</u>	<u>Surface Works</u>	<u>Total</u>
Moose Jaw	\$32,500. (1)		\$32,500.
<u>TOWN</u>			
Gull Lake	29,395. 8,840.		38,235.
	\$38,235.		\$38,235.
<u>VILLAGE</u>			
Gainsborough	\$2,790.		\$2,790.
(1) Storm Sewers		<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	\$73,525.

APPENDIX E

AUTHORIZATION OF SINKING FUND INVESTMENTS

<u>Sinking Fund</u>	<u>Securities Purchased</u>	<u>Face Value of Security</u>
	City of Regina	59,000.
	City of Regina	20,000.
	City of Regina	10,000.
	City of Regina	11,000.
	City of Regina	12,000.
	City of Regina	2,000.
	Alberta Resources Railway	100,000.
	City of Regina	38,000.
	City of Regina	25,000.
	City of Regina	26,000.
	Alberta Resources Railway	100,000.
	City of Regina	5,000.
	City of Regina	1,000.
	Alberta Resources Railway	100,000.
	Alberta Resources Railway	250,000.
	Ontario Hydro-Electric	100,000.
	Province of Ontario	75,000.
	City of Regina	25,000.
	City of Regina	25,000.
	City of Regina	25,000.
	Manitoba Telephone System	200,000.
	Dominion of Canada	35,000.
	Alberta Resources Railway	250,000.
	Alberta Resources Railway	100,000.
	City of Regina	11,000.
	City of Regina	25,000.
	City of Regina	5,000.
	Ontario Hydro-Electric	28,000.
	Province of New Brunswick	50,000.

APPENDIX E (Continued)Sinking Fund
Regina, City
(Continued)

<u>Securities Purchased</u>	<u>Face Value of Security</u>
City of Regina	7,000.
Province of Quebec	50,000.
Dominion of Canada	400,000.
City of Regina	26,000.
Alberta Resources Railway	239,000.
Town of Allan	12,000.
City of Yorkton	2,000.
City of Regina	15,000.
City of Regina	15,000.
City of Regina	3,000.
City of Regina	15,000.
City of Regina	5,000.
City of Saskatoon	237,000.
City of Saskatoon	160,000.
Alberta Telephones	700,000.
Manitoba Hydro-Electric	100,000.
	\$3,699,000.
City of Saskatoon	6,794.
City of Saskatoon	18,461.
City of Saskatoon	619,461.
	\$644,716.

Saskatoon, City

APPENDIX F

SURPLUS SINKING FUND EARNINGS

WITHDRAWALS*

<u>Sinking Fund</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Regina, City	Paying current or other expenditures	\$407,305.
Regina, City	Payment to Saskatchewan Power Corporation from the Corporation Sinking Fund	\$34,031.

* Surplus earnings of the current year only

APPENDIX G

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATIONS RESPECTING PURCHASE AND SALE OF INVESTMENTS CONSIDERED BY BOARD IN 1970

<u>Local Authorities</u>	<u>Number of Approvals</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Number of Sales</u>	<u>Amount of Sales</u>
Cities	9		Nil	Nil
Towns	6	4,609,760.	Nil	Nil
Villages	1	126,435.	1	14,000.
Rural Municipalities	Nil	14,000.	Nil	Nil
School Units	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
School Districts	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Union Hospitals	13	1,693,267.	Nil	Nil
Rural Telephones	Nil	Nil	1	1,500.
	29	\$6,443,462.	2	\$15,500.

APPENDIX H

CAPITAL ACCOUNTS INCLUDING ELECTRIC LIGHT TRUST ACCOUNTS

<u>Local Authorities</u>	<u>Number of Withdrawals</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Cities	10	824,296.
1 Town	2	29,080.
2 Hospitals	2	4,160.
		\$857,536.

APPENDIX I

CAPITAL TRUST FUNDS

CITIES

	<u>Number</u>
New funds created	1
Increases in existing funds	Nil
Decreases in existing funds	Nil
Withdrawals	3
Prepayments	Nil
Total Authorizations	4

ANALYSIS OF AUTHORIZATIONS

New funds created
Increases in existing funds
Decreases in existing funds
Withdrawals
Prepayments

ANALYSIS OF WITHDRAWALS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Purchase of Machinery</u>	<u>Construction or Purchase of Bldgs.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
1				
2	4,500.		49,223.	4,500.
				49,223.
			\$49,223.	\$53,723.

Withdrawals are required to be repaid to the fund over a period of years, usually ten.

APPENDIX I (Continued)

CAPITAL TRUST FUNDS

TOWNS

ANALYSIS OF AUTHORIZATIONS

New funds created
Increases in existing funds
Decreases in existing funds
Withdrawals
Prepayments

<u>Number</u>	
1	
3	
Nil	
12	
Nil	
<u>16</u>	<u>Total Authorizations</u>

ANALYSIS OF WITHDRAWALS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Purchase of Machinery</u>
3	20,220.
	<u>\$20,220.</u>

Construction or Purchase of Bldgs.

<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
66,116.	20,220.
<u>\$66,116.</u>	<u>66,116.</u>
	<u>\$86,336.</u>

Withdrawals are required to be repaid to the fund over a period of years, usually ten.

APPENDIX I (Continued)

CAPITAL TRUST FUNDS

VILLAGES

ANALYSIS OF AUTHORIZATIONS

New funds created
Increases in existing funds
Decreases in existing funds
Withdrawals
Prepayments

<u>Number</u>	
4	
Nil	
Nil	
3	
Nil	
7	Total Authorizations

ANALYSIS OF WITHDRAWALS

Number
Purchase of Machinery

Construction or
Purchase of Bldgs.

<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$7,200.	\$7,200.

Withdrawals are required to be repaid to the fund over a period of years, usually ten.

APPENDIX I (Continued)

CAPITAL TRUST FUNDS
RURAL MUNICIPALITIES

ANALYSIS OF AUTHORIZATIONS

New funds created		
Increases in existing funds		
Decreases in existing funds		
Withdrawals		
Prepayments		
	<u>Number</u>	
	6	
	4	
	Nil	
	47	
	5	
	<u>62</u>	
Total Authorizations		
	<u>2</u>	
Refusals		

ANALYSIS OF WITHDRAWALS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Purchase of Road Machinery</u>	<u>Construction or Purchase of Bldgs.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
43	585,372.			585,372.
1		9,000.		9,000.
3			14,510.	14,510.
	<u>\$585,372.</u>	<u>\$9,000.</u>	<u>\$14,510.</u>	<u>\$608,882.</u>

Withdrawals are required to be repaid to the fund over a period of years, usually ten.

APPENDIX J

LOCAL AUTHORITY ESTIMATES APPROVED AND TAX RATES AUTHORIZED

Local Authority	Mill Rates Authorized			Others	Total
	Municipal	Public School	High School	Separate School	
Cana, R.M. No. 214	40				40
Deer Forks, R.M. No. 232	39			1.3	40.3
Douglas, R.M. No. 436	34				34
Foam Lake, R.M. No. 276	35				35
Humboldt, Town	44	20	18	2.5	F.S. 84.5 S.S. 88.5
Invergordon, R.M. No. 430	30				30
Invermay, R.M. No. 305	38				38
Kerrobert, Town	45				45
Lost River, R.M. No. 313	36			2	38
Scott, Town	35				35
Surprise Valley, R.M. No. 9	31			2	33
Tullymet, R.M. No. 216	38				38
Uranium City, Municipal Corporation -	76				76
- District 1					
- District 2					
- Mine equip. Mill Bldgs. and Mill Business	112				112
- Other	73				73
- District 3	67				67
Watrous, Town	41.5	41.5			83

APPENDIX K

INQUIRIES AND APPEALS HELD BY BOARD 1970

<u>Local Authority</u>	<u>Subject of Inquiry or Appeal</u>	<u>Date</u>
Lumsden, Town	Correct alleged errors in the Special Assessment Roll of the Town	February 17
Moose Jaw, City	Construct Storm Sewers under Section 4(1)(e) The Local Improvements Act	March 4
Prelate Union Hospital District	Apportion proceeds of the sale of assets of the hospital board in accordance with Section 69 of The Union Hospital Act	May 27
Frontier Union Hospital District	Hearing to discuss fixing terms and conditions to be set by the Board with regard to disposal of property, grounds and equipment by the hospital board	May 28
Lloydminster, City	Variation of Franchise for Distribution of Electric Light and Power to City - City of Lloydminster and Canadian Utilities Limited	November 4

APPENDIX LORDERS ISSUED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD IN 1970Under Section 9 of The Public Health Act and
Sections 11, 17, 45 and 58 of The Union Hospital ActPublic Health Act (Section 9)

Melfort-Tisdale No. 11
 Moose Jaw-Assiniboia-Gravelbourg No. 2
 North Battleford No. 13
 Prince Albert No. 12
 Regina Rural No. 5
 Rosetown-Biggar-Kindersley No. 7
 Saskatoon Rural No. 8
 Swift Current No. 1
 Weyburn-Estevan No. 3
 Yorkton-Melville No. 10

Fixing the amount of cost to be borne by participating municipalities in Health Regions

Union Hospital Act (Section 11)

Bienfait-Coalfields
 Big River
 Borden
 Climax-Bracken
 Estonia
 Hafford
 Kindersley
 Lanigan
 Leader
 Leoville
 Maple Creek
 Meadow Lake
 Melfort
 Ponteix

Fixing share of estimated cost to be borne by participating areas (establishment) redistribution and redefined areas

APPENDIX L (Continued)Union Hospital Act (Section 11) (Continued)

Prince Albert
 Redvers
 Rosthern
 Shellbrook
 Unity
 Watrous
 Wilkie

Union Hospital Act (Section 45)

Battlefords
 Wilkie

Authorizing levy to create surplus for
 Capital Reserve Funds

Union Hospital Act (Section 58)

Carrot River
 Hudson Bay
 Ponteix
 Rosthern
 Unity

Fixing terms and conditions under which
 an area may be added to a hospital
 district

Union Hospital Act (Section 17)

Wilkie

Fixing terms and conditions under which
 an area may be withdrawn from a hospital
 district

APPENDIX OMISCELLANEOUS APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH BY THE BOARD IN 1970

<u>Local Authority</u>	<u>Total</u>
Cities	80
Towns	79
Villages	52
Rural Municipalities	12
School Districts	5
School Units	7
Union Hospital Districts	32
- Under Section 20 of The Union Hospital Act	2
Rural Telephones	10
Conservation and Development Areas	4
School Districts Surplus Funds Account	4
Power Consent - Mr. Harry Kuzyka, Battleford	1
Lloydminster Gas Company (Withdraw from Depreciation Reserve Account)	1
Local Government Board - Appointment to Advisory Committee	1
- General	17
Staff	7
	<u>314</u>

APPENDIX QHOUSING COMPANY AGREEMENTS APPROVEDUnder The Housing and Special-care Homes Act

<u>BETWEEN</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>OTHER AUTHORITY</u>
Battlefords River Heights Lodge Limited, The		Rockhaven, Village
Frontier Housing Co. Ltd.		Frontier, Village Frontier, R.M. No. 19
Last Mountain Pioneer Home		Earl Grey, Village
New Hope Pioneer Lodge		Arcola, Town
Pioneers Haven Co.		Doddsland, Village
Red Deer Nursing Home		Bjorkdale, R. M. No. 426 Hudson Bay, Town Porcupine Plain, Town Porcupine, R.M. No. 395
Southwest Nursing Home		Climax, Village Lone Tree, R. M. No. 18
Wawota Housing Corporation		Wawken, R.M. No. 93 Wawota, Village Walpole, R.M. No. 92
Wolf Willow Lodge Ltd.		Arlington, R.M. No. 79 Eastend, Town White Valley, R.M. No. 49

APPENDIX R

DEFERRALS APPROVED BY THE BOARD 1970

<u>C I T I E S</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Repayment</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
Regina	17,458.	1971 to 1980 - 8%	Financing city's share of land acquisition costs by Wascana Centre Authority
Regina	176,550.	1971 to 1973 - 8%	Paying part of the city's share of the 1970 Local Improvement Program
North Battleford	15,000.	1971 to 1973 - 8½%	Paying part of the cost of renovation and addition to the sewage treatment plant
	<u>\$209,008.</u>		
<u>T O W N S</u>			
Hudson Bay	8,671.	1971 & 1972 - 8½%	Entering into an agreement with Saskatchewan Power Corporation for providing street lighting
Imperial	50,000.	1972 - 9%	Paying part of the cost of constructing a skating rink
Outlook	7,000.	1971 & 1972 - 8½%	Paying part of the cost of water main extension
Radville	6,250.	1971 to 1975	Paying part of the cost of purchasing property and equipment

APPENDIX R (Continued)

DEFERRALS APPROVED BY THE BOARD 1970

<u>T O W N S (Cont'd.)</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Repayment</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
Tisdale	9,625.	1971 & 1972 - 9%	Paying part of the cost of improvements to sewerage system
	<u>\$81,546.</u>		
<u>V I L L A G E S</u>			
Colonsay	2,300.	1971 - 9%	Paying part of the cost of extension to sewage lagoon
Dalmeny	2,400.	1971 to 1973 - 8½%	Paying part of the cost of purchasing road machinery
Turtleford	6,000.	1971 to 1973 - 8%	Paying part of the cost of enlargement to filtration plant
	<u>\$10,700.</u>		
<u>SCHOOL UNITS</u>			
Yorkton No. 36	<u>\$15,000.</u>	1971 to 1973 - 9%	Addition to school at Theodore

APPENDIX R (Continued)

DEFERRALS APPROVED BY THE BOARD 1970

HOSPITAL DISTRICTS

Fillmore
Moosomin

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Repayment</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
18,000.	1971 to 1973 - 8%	Constructing doctor residence
7,000.	1971	Renovations to Moosomin Union Hospital
<u>\$25,000.</u>		

RURAL MUNICIPALITY

Barrier Valley No. 307
Deer Forks No. 232
Fertile Valley No. 285
Lake Johnston No. 102
Last Mountain Valley
No. 250
Redberry No. 435
Saltcoats No. 213
Shellbrook No. 493
Shellbrook No. 493
Three Lakes No. 400
Usborne No. 310

16,800.	1971 & 1972 - 8½%	Purchase road machinery
7,500.	1971 - 8½%	Construct municipal office
14,000.	1971 & 1972 - 8½%	Purchase road machinery
5,000.	1971 - 8½%	Purchase road machinery
11,000.	1971 - 9%	Purchase road machinery
2,275.	1971	Construct one mile access road
5,000.	1971 - 8½%	Construct municipal office
2,667.	1971 & 1972	R. M. share in Sturgeon Lake Regional Park
13,120.	1971	Entering into gravel contract
10,000.	1971 & 1972 - 8%	Purchase road machinery
18,000.	1971 & 1972 - 7½%	Purchase road machinery
<u>\$105,362.</u>		

GRAND TOTAL

\$446,616.

APPENDIX S

WATER RATES AND/OR SEWER SERVICE CHARGE BYLAWS APPROVED BY THE BOARD 1970

T O W N S

Arcola	Sewer/Water	Lemberg	Water
Asquith	Sewer	Lumsden	Sewer
Assiniboia	Water	Luseland	Sewer/Water
Balcarras	Water	Meadow Lake	Water
Battleford	Water	Milestone	Water
Biggar	Water	Morse	Sewer/Water
Big River	Sewer/Water	Mossbank	Sewer
Blaine Lake	Sewer/Water	Naicam	Water
Bredenbury	Sewer/Water	Nipawin	Sewer/Water
Canora	Sewer/Water	Nokomis	Water
Carlyle	Water	Norquay	Sewer/Water
Carrot River	Sewer/Water	Oxbow	Water
Craik	Water	Ponteix	Sewer/Water
Creighton	Water	Porcupine Plain	Sewer/Water
Cudworth	Sewer	Preeceville	Sewer/Water
Cut Knife	Water	Rocanville	Sewer/Water
Delisle	Water	Rosetown	Water
Eastend	Sewer/Water	Rose Valley	Water
Eatonia	Water	Rosthern	Sewer/Water
Eston	Water	Saltcoats	Water
Francis	Sewer	Shaunavon	Sewer/Water
Govan	Water	Shellbrook	Water
Herbert	Water	Spiritwood	Water
Indian Head	Sewer/Water	Star City	Water
Kamsack	Sewer/Water	Stoughton	Sewer/Water
Kerrobert	Sewer	Sturgis	Water
Kindersley	Sewer/Water	Tisdale	Sewer
Kyle	Water	Unity	Water
Lafleche	Water	Watrous	Water
Lampmar	Sewer/Water	Wolseley	Sewer/Water
		Wynyard	Sewer/Water

APPENDIX S (Continued)

WATER RATES AND/OR SEWER SERVICE CHARGE
BYLAWS APPROVED BY THE BOARD 1970

V I L L A G E S

Alida	Sewer	Lake Alma	Sewer/Water
Alsask	Sewer/Water	Landis	Sewer
Avonlea	Water	Lashburn	Sewer/Water
Bethune	Water	Lintlaw	Sewer
Borden	Water	Lipton	Water
Burstall	Sewer/Water	Manitou Beach	Sewer
Chaplin	Sewer/Water	Montmartre	Water
Climax	Sewer/Water	Neilburg	Sewer
Coronach	Water	Neudorf	Water
Craven	Water	Odessa	Sewer/Water
Denzil	Water	Plunkett	Sewer/Water
Earl Grey	Water	St. Brieux	Sewer/Water
Elbow	Water	St. Gregor	Water
Ferland	Water	Simpson	Sewer/Water
Fillmore	Water	Spy Hill	Sewer/Water
Glen Ewen	Sewer	Turtleford	Sewer/Water
Glentworth	Sewer	Wasca	Sewer
Hodgeville	Water	Windthorst	Sewer/Water
		Yellow Creek	Sewer/Water